Thermal Effects on Nonthermal Species



Michael Ratz



August 21 2023



Based on:

- W. Buchmüller, K. Hamaguchi, O. Lebedev & M.R. Nucl. Phys. B699, 292-308 (2004)
- B. Lillard, M.R., T. Tait & S. Trojanowski JCAP 1807 no. 07, 056 (2018)
- V. Knapp-Pérez, G. Mohlabeng, M.R. & T. Tait, in preparation

Disclaimers and apologies Disclaimers and abologies

- very little citations
- many cartoons

Main message



standard model (SM) particles interact via gauge and Yukawa couplings

Main message



- standard model (SM) particles interact via gauge and Yukawa couplings
- thermal history of SM particles discussed in many textbooks

.H

Main message



- standard model (SM) particles interact via gauge and Yukawa couplings
- thermal history of SM particles discussed in many textbooks
- naive picture: equilibrium thermodynamics only concerns equilibrated species

Main message



- standard model (SM) particles interact via gauge and Yukawa couplings
- thermal history of SM particles discussed in many textbooks
- naive picture: equilibrium thermodynamics only concerns equilibrated species

Main message of this talk

"equilibrium-style" thermodynamics can be particularly important for nonequilibrated species

Overview

couplings may not be God-given but consequence of some dynamics

Overview

- couplings may not be God-given but consequence of some dynamics
- consider field-dependent couplings/masses

$$g = g(S/\Lambda) \ , \quad y = y(S/\Lambda) \quad \text{and/or} \quad m = m(S) \sim \lambda \, S$$

weakly coupled scalar (modulus, flavon, dark scalar ...)

Overview

- \square consider field–dependent couplings/masses

$$\begin{split} g &= g(S/\Lambda) \ , \quad y = y(S/\Lambda) \quad \text{and/or} \quad m = m(S) \sim \lambda \, S \\ &\implies S \text{ is weakly coupled: } \begin{cases} \Lambda \text{ is large (e.g. } \Lambda \sim M_{\rm P}) \\ \text{and} \\ \lambda \text{ is small } (\lambda \ll 1) \\ & \frac{T^3}{\Lambda^2} \ll \frac{T^2}{M_{\rm P}} \quad \text{for all relevant } T \end{split}$$

Overview

ß

- ${\tt I}{\tt S}{\tt S}$ consider field–dependent couplings/masses

$$g = g(S/\Lambda) , \quad y = y(S/\Lambda) \quad \text{and/or} \quad m = m(S) \sim \lambda S$$

S is weakly coupled:
$$\begin{cases} \Lambda \text{ is large (e.g. } \Lambda \sim M_{\rm P}) \\ \text{and} \\ \lambda \text{ is small } (\lambda \ll 1) \end{cases}$$

$$|\lambda|^2 T < rac{T^2}{M_{
m P}}$$
 for all relevant T

Overview

- couplings may not be God-given but consequence of some dynamics
- consider field-dependent couplings/masses

$$\begin{split} g &= g(S/\Lambda) \ , \quad y = y(S/\Lambda) \quad \text{and/or} \quad m = m(S) \sim \lambda \, S \\ &\implies S \text{ is weakly coupled: } \begin{cases} \Lambda \text{ is large (e.g. } \Lambda \sim M_{\rm P}) \\ \text{and} \\ \lambda \text{ is small } (\lambda \ll 1) \end{cases} \end{split}$$

 ${\bf \boxtimes}~S$ is "light"

• in SUSY models often $m_S \sim m_{3/2} \stackrel{?}{\sim} {
m TeV}$

gravitino mass

Overview

- couplings may not be God-given but consequence of some dynamics
- consider field-dependent couplings/masses

$$g = g(S/\Lambda) , \quad y = y(S/\Lambda) \quad \text{and/or} \quad m = m(S) \sim \lambda S$$

- S is weakly coupled:
$$\begin{cases} \Lambda \text{ is large (e.g. } \Lambda \sim M_{\rm P}) \\ \text{and} \\ \lambda \text{ is small } (\lambda \ll 1) \end{cases}$$

 ${\bf \boxtimes}~S$ is "light"

ß

- in SUSY models often $m_S \sim m_{3/2} \stackrel{?}{\sim} {
 m TeV}$
- much lighter scalars popular

Overview

- couplings may not be God-given but consequence of some dynamics R
- consider field-dependent couplings/masses

$$g = g(S/\Lambda) \ , \quad y = y(S/\Lambda) \quad \text{and/or} \quad m = m(S) \sim \lambda \, S$$

 $\mathbb{S} \text{ is weakly coupled: } \begin{cases} \Lambda \text{ is large (e.g. } \Lambda \sim M_{\mathsf{P}}) \\ \text{and} \\ \lambda \text{ is small } (\lambda \ll 1) \end{cases}$

$$\lambda$$
 is small ($\lambda \ll 1$)

Is "light"

- in SUSY models often $m_S \sim m_{3/2} \stackrel{?}{\sim} \text{TeV}$
- much lighter scalars popular
- it is often extremely hard to test these scalars at colliders because they are usually very weakly coupled

e.g. C Bauer, Schell & Plehn (2016)

Overview

- couplings may not be God-given but consequence of some dynamics RP -
- consider field-dependent couplings/masses

$$g = g(S/\Lambda) \ , \quad y = y(S/\Lambda) \quad \text{and/or} \quad m = m(S) \sim \lambda \, S$$

 $\mathbb{S} \text{ is weakly coupled: } \begin{cases} \Lambda \text{ is large (e.g. } \Lambda \sim M_{\mathsf{P}}) \\ \text{and} \\ \lambda \text{ is small } (\lambda \ll 1) \end{cases}$

$$\lambda$$
 is small ($\lambda \ll 1$)

Is "light"

- in SUSY models often $m_S \sim m_{3/2} \stackrel{?}{\sim} \text{TeV}$
- much lighter scalars popular
- it is often extremely hard to test these scalars at colliders because they are usually very weakly coupled

e.g. C Bauer, Schell & Plehn (2016)

however, the existence of these scalars has dramatic impacts on the early R. universe because they are usually very weakly coupled

Overview

- couplings may not be God-given but consequence of some dynamics RP -
- consider field-dependent couplings/masses

$$g = g(S/\Lambda) \ , \quad y = y(S/\Lambda) \quad \text{and/or} \quad m = m(S) \sim \lambda \, S$$

 $\mathbb{S} \text{ is weakly coupled: } \begin{cases} \Lambda \text{ is large (e.g. } \Lambda \sim M_{\mathsf{P}}) \\ \text{and} \\ \lambda \text{ is small } (\lambda \ll 1) \end{cases}$

$$\lambda$$
 is small ($\lambda \ll 1$)

Is "light"

- in SUSY models often $m_S \sim m_{3/2} \stackrel{?}{\sim} \text{TeV}$
- much lighter scalars popular
- it is often extremely hard to test these scalars at colliders because they are usually very weakly coupled

e.g. C Bauer, Schell & Plehn (2016)

however, the existence of these scalars has dramatic impacts on the early universe because they are usually very weakly coupled

purpose of this talk:

discuss weakly coupled scalars in the hot early universe

weakly coupled scalars weakly conbled scalars 8[Thermal potential Lueual botential

Main focus of this talk

 \square what can we say about field-dependent couplings at high T?



Main focus of this talk

 \mathbb{R} what can we say about field-dependent couplings at high T?

see lectures by Joe Davighi for many more applications of anomalies

one can figure this out using anomalies...

Buchmüller, Hamaguchi & MR (2003)

Thermal Effects on Nonthermal Species

Thermal potential of S

Main focus of this talk

 \square what can we say about field-dependent couplings at high T?

... but it is more convenient to consider free energy

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F} &= \mathcal{F}(T,S) \\ &\simeq -\frac{\pi^2}{90} g_* T^4 + T^2 \left(\sum_i c_i^{(g)} g_i^2(S) + \sum_f c_f^{(y)} y_f^2(S) + \sum_j c_j^{(m)} m_j^2(S) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Main focus of this talk

 \square what can we say about field-dependent couplings at high T?

consider free energy

Main focus of this talk

 \square what can we say about field-dependent couplings at high T?

consider free energy

Main focus of this talk

 ${}^{\scriptsize\hbox{\tiny IMS}}$ what can we say about field-dependent couplings at high T?

consider free energy

Main focus of this talk

 \square what can we say about field-dependent couplings at high T?

consider free energy

🗹 Fardon, Nelson & Weiner (2004); 🖸 Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004); 🖸 Lillard, MR, Tait & Trojanowski (2018)

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{F} &= \mathcal{F}(T,S) \\ &\simeq -\frac{\pi^2}{90} g_* T^4 + T^2 \left(\sum_i c_i^{(g)} g_i^2(S) + \sum_f c_f^{(y)} y_f^2(S) + \sum_j c_j^{(m)} m_j^2(S) \right) \\ \text{where} \\ &c^{(g)} = \frac{T^2}{64\pi^2} (N_c^2 - 1)(N_c + 3N_f) \quad \text{for } \operatorname{SU}(N_c) \end{split}$$

 $\# \mbox{ of colors}$

of flavors

Main focus of this talk

what can we say about field-dependent couplings at high T? RF .

Image: second consider free energy

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{F} &= \mathcal{F}(T,S) \\ &\simeq -\frac{\pi^2}{90} g_* T^4 + T^2 \left(\sum_i c_i^{(g)} g_i^2(S) + \sum_f c_f^{(y)} y_f^2(S) + \sum_j c_j^{(m)} m_j^2(S) \right) \\ &\text{where} \end{split}$$

$$c^{(g)} = \frac{T^2}{64\pi^2} (N_c^2 - 1)(N_c + 3N_f) \text{ for } SU(N_c)$$

$$c^{(y)}_f = \frac{5}{576}T^2 \text{ per fermion}$$

Main focus of this talk

 \square what can we say about field-dependent couplings at high T?

consider free energy

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{F} &= \mathcal{F}(T,S) \\ &\simeq -\frac{\pi^2}{90} g_* T^4 + T^2 \left(\sum_i c_i^{(g)} g_i^2(S) + \sum_f c_f^{(y)} y_f^2(S) + \sum_j c_j^{(m)} m_j^2(S) \right) \\ \text{where} \\ &c^{(g)} &= \frac{T^2}{64\pi^2} (N_c^2 - 1) (N_c + 3N_f) \quad \text{for SU}(N_c) \\ &c_f^{(y)} &= \frac{5}{576} T^2 \quad \text{per fermion} \\ &c_j^{(m)} &= \frac{1}{24} \quad \text{e.g. if} \qquad m_j = h_j S \\ &\curvearrowright \ \Delta \mathcal{F} &= \frac{|h_j|^2}{24} T^2 S^2 \text{ for a boson} \end{split}$$

Main focus of this talk

what can we say about field-dependent couplings at high T? B

Image: Image

C Fardon, Nelson & Weiner (2004); Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004); Lillard, MR, Tait & Trojanowski (2018)

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{F} &= \mathcal{F}(T,S) \\ &\simeq -\frac{\pi^2}{90} g_* T^4 + T^2 \left(\sum_i c_i^{(g)} g_i^2(S) + \sum_f c_f^{(y)} y_f^2(S) + \sum_j c_j^{(m)} m_j^2(S) \right) \\ &\text{where} \end{split}$$

wiiere

$$\begin{split} c^{(g)} &= \frac{T^2}{64\pi^2} (N_c^2 - 1)(N_c + 3N_f) \quad \text{for SU}(N_c) \\ c^{(y)}_f &= \frac{5}{576} T^2 \quad \text{per fermion} \\ c^{(m)}_j &= \frac{1}{24} \end{split}$$

crucially the coefficients are positive

Main focus of this talk

what can we say about field-dependent couplings at high T? R

Isomorphic consider free energy

C Fardon, Nelson & Weiner (2004); C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004); C Lillard, MR, Tait & Trojanowski (2018)

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{F} &= \mathcal{F}(T,S) \\ &\simeq -\frac{\pi^2}{90} g_* T^4 + T^2 \left(\sum_i c_i^{(g)} g_i^2(S) + \sum_f c_f^{(y)} y_f^2(S) + \sum_j c_j^{(m)} m_j^2(S) \right) \\ &\text{where} \end{split}$$

$$c^{(g)} = \frac{T^2}{64\pi^2} (N_c^2 - 1)(N_c + 3N_f) \text{ for SU}(N_c)$$

$$c_f^{(y)} = \frac{5}{576}T^2 \text{ per fermion}$$

$$c_j^{(m)} = \frac{1}{24}$$

crucially the coefficients are positive

free energy "wants" couplings and masses small

Thermal potential of \boldsymbol{S}

S-dependence of free energy

 ${}^{\scriptsize\hbox{\tiny IMS}}$ dependence of free energy on mass of a boson/fermion

🗹 Dolan & Jackiw (1974); 🗹 Fardon, Nelson & Weiner (2004);...🖸 Batell & Ghalsasi (2023)

$$\delta \mathcal{F} = -\frac{\nu}{2\pi^2} T^4 J_{B/F} \left(\frac{m^2(S)}{T^2}\right)$$

$$J_{B/F}(y^2) = \int_{0}^{\infty} dx \, x^2 \, \ln\left[1 \mp e^{-\sqrt{x^2 + y^2}}\right]$$

S-dependence of free energy

dependence of free energy on mass of a boson/fermion

$$\delta \mathcal{F} = -\frac{\nu}{2\pi^2} T^4 J_{B/F} \left(\frac{m^2(S)}{T^2}\right)$$

 ${}^{\scriptstyle \hbox{\scriptsize ISS}}$ leading contributions to ${\mathcal F}$ from gauge and Yukawa interactions

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{non-interacting} + \Delta \mathcal{F}_{gauge}^{(1)} + \Delta \mathcal{F}_{Yukawa}^{(1)} + \dots$$

S-dependence of free energy

dependence of free energy on mass of a boson/fermion

$$\delta \mathcal{F} = -\frac{\nu}{2\pi^2} T^4 J_{B/F} \left(\frac{m^2(S)}{T^2}\right)$$

 ${}^{\scriptstyle \hbox{\scriptsize ISS}}$ leading contributions to ${\mathcal F}$ from gauge and Yukawa interactions



Thermal potential of \boldsymbol{S}

S-dependence of free energy

dependence of free energy on mass of a boson/fermion

$$\delta \mathcal{F} = -\frac{\nu}{2\pi^2} T^4 J_{B/F} \left(\frac{m^2(S)}{T^2}\right)$$

 ${}^{\scriptstyle \hbox{\scriptsize ISS}}$ leading contributions to ${\mathcal F}$ from gauge and Yukawa interactions



Thermal potential of \boldsymbol{S}

S-dependence of free energy

 ${}^{\scriptsize\hbox{\tiny IMS}}$ dependence of free energy on mass of a boson/fermion

$$\delta \mathcal{F} = -\frac{\nu}{2\pi^2} T^4 J_{B/F} \left(\frac{m^2(S)}{T^2}\right)$$

 ${}^{\scriptsize\hbox{\tiny IMS}}$ leading contributions to ${\mathcal F}$ from gauge and Yukawa interactions



S-dependence of free energy

dependence of free energy on mass of a boson/fermion

$$\begin{split} \delta \mathcal{F} &= -\frac{\nu}{2\pi^2} T^4 \, J_{B/F} \left(\frac{m^2(S)}{T^2} \right) \\ \alpha_2 &= \frac{3}{196} (N_C^2 - 1) \left(N_C + 3N_F \right) \text{ for } \mathrm{SU}(N_C) \text{ w/ } N_F \text{ fundamentals} \\ \mathcal{F} &= \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{non-interacting}} + \Delta \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{gauge}}^{(1)} + \Delta \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Yukawa}}^{(1)} + \cdots \\ \Delta \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{gauge}}^{(1)} &= \alpha_2 \, g^2 \, T^4 \\ \Delta \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Yukawa}}^{(1)} &= \frac{5 \, |y|^2}{576} \, T^4 \quad \text{per Weyl fermion} \end{split}$$

Qualitative discussion



Qualitative discussion



Qualitative discussion


Qualitative discussion



Qualitative discussion



Qualitative discussion



Implications

couplings at high temperature

Implications

- couplings at high temperature
- 🖙 moduli problems

Implications

- couplings at high temperature
- 🖙 moduli problems
- flavon dynamics

common relation between gauge coupling and dilaton

$$\frac{S}{\Lambda} = \frac{1}{g^2}$$
 in strings: $\Lambda = M_{\rm P}$

common relation between gauge coupling and dilaton

$$\frac{S}{\Lambda} = \frac{1}{g^2}$$

competition between zero-temperature potential and free energy

$$\mathscr{V}_{\text{eff}} \simeq \frac{m_0^2}{2} \left(S - S_0 \right)^2 + \mathcal{F}(T, S)$$

common relation between gauge coupling and dilaton

$$\frac{S}{\Lambda} = \frac{1}{g^2}$$

competition between zero-temperature potential and free energy

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{V}_{\text{eff}} &\simeq \frac{m_0^2}{2} \left(S - S_0 \right)^2 + \mathcal{F}(T, S) \\ &= \frac{m_0^2}{2} \left(S - S_0 \right)^2 + \frac{c T^4}{S} \end{aligned} \qquad \not \mathcal{F} \supset c g^2 T^4 = \frac{c T^4}{S} \end{aligned}$$

common relation between gauge coupling and dilaton

$$\frac{S}{\Lambda} = \frac{1}{g^2}$$

competition between zero-temperature potential and free energy

$$T \sim T_* := \sqrt{m_0 \Lambda}$$

common relation between gauge coupling and dilaton

$$\frac{S}{\Lambda} = \frac{1}{g^2}$$

competition between zero-temperature potential and free energy

$$T \sim T_* := \sqrt{m_0 \Lambda}$$

 ${}^{\scriptstyle \hbox{\scriptsize ISS}}$ gauge couplings turn essentially off at T_*

high temperature yigh temberature ^{3‡} Bilaton destabilization

Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)

$${}^{\scriptstyle
m I\!S\!
m S}$$
 typical dilaton potential: $g^2=1/S$

 \boldsymbol{S} is real part of stringy dilaton

C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)


C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



 \blacksquare switch on thermal corrections $\propto 1/S$

C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



 $\$ switch on thermal corrections $\propto 1/S$

Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)



C Buchmüller, Hamaguchi, Lebedev & MR (2004)





Thermal Effects on Nonthermal Species

Dilaton destabilization



Thermal Effects on Nonthermal Species

Dilaton destabilization



Thermal Effects on Nonthermal Species

Dilaton destabilization



Discussion

if the dilaton has been destabilized, it will run away and cannot come back

model-independent contraint:

$$T_R \lesssim T_* \sim \sqrt{m_S M_{\rm P}}$$

reheating temperature (maximal temperature of the radiation dominated universe)

Discussion

if the dilaton has been destabilized, it will run away and cannot come back

model-independent contraint:

$$T_R \lesssim T_* \sim \sqrt{m_S M_{\rm P}}$$

model-dependent bounds on the energy density of the universe during inflation

☑ Kallosh & Linde (2004)

Discussion

 ${\ensuremath{\,^{\scriptsize \hbox{\tiny SM}}}}$ if the dilaton has been destabilized, it will run away and cannot come back

model-independent contraint:

$$T_R \lesssim T_* \sim \sqrt{m_S M_{\rm P}}$$

model-dependent bounds on the energy density of the universe during inflation

```
☑ Kallosh & Linde (2004)
```

the bounds can be circumvented by stabilizing the field combination that fixes the gauge coupling in a different way (i.e. w/ an infinite barrier)
C Kane & Winkler (2019)

Moduli problems

Moduli problems




Moduli problems

Moduli problems



Moduli problems

Moduli problems





Moduli problems

Moduli problems





Solutions Veight loss Meight loss

Weight loss solutions



https://unsplash.com

Weight loss solutions

Weight loss solutions... in cosmology



main message

if masses and couplings of equilibrated particles depend on S, the dynamics of S will be such that the masses and couplings *decrease*

Weight loss solutions

Weight loss solutions... in cosmology



main message

if masses and couplings of equilibrated particles depend on S, the dynamics of S will be such that the masses and couplings *decrease* i.e. the solution of the equations of motion entails weight loss



Constraints on flavons

Field-dependent fermion masses

🖙 e.g. Froggatt-Nielsen mechanism

$$\mathscr{L}_{\rm FN} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} y_{ij}^{u} \left(\frac{S}{\Lambda}\right)^{n_{ij}^{u}} \overline{Q}_{i} \widetilde{\Phi} u_{j} + \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} y_{ij}^{d} \left(\frac{S}{\Lambda}\right)^{n_{ij}^{d}} \overline{Q}_{i} \Phi d_{j} + \text{h.c.}$$
flavon

Constraints on flavons

Field-dependent fermion masses

🖙 e.g. Froggatt–Nielsen mechanism

☑ Froggatt & Nielsen (1979); see lectures by Mu-Chun Chen

$$\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{FN}} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} y_{ij}^{u} \left(\frac{S}{\Lambda}\right)^{n_{ij}^{u}} \overline{Q}_{i} \, \widetilde{\Phi} \, u_{j} + \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} y_{ij}^{d} \left(\frac{S}{\Lambda}\right)^{n_{ij}^{d}} \overline{Q}_{i} \, \Phi \, d_{j} + \mathrm{h.c.}$$

potential

 $\mathscr{V}_S=-\mu_S^2|S|^2+\lambda_S|S|^4+\lambda_{S\Phi}|S|^2|\Phi|^2+\mathsf{U}(1)_{\rm FN}$ breaking terms

Constraints on flavons

Field-dependent fermion masses

🖙 e.g. Froggatt–Nielsen mechanism

☑ Froggatt & Nielsen (1979); see lectures by Mu–Chun Chen

$$\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{FN}} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} y_{ij}^{u} \left(\frac{S}{\Lambda}\right)^{n_{ij}^{u}} \overline{Q}_{i} \, \widetilde{\Phi} \, u_{j} + \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} y_{ij}^{d} \left(\frac{S}{\Lambda}\right)^{n_{ij}^{d}} \overline{Q}_{i} \, \Phi \, d_{j} + \mathrm{h.c.}$$

potential

$$\mathscr{V}_S=-\mu_S^2|S|^2+\lambda_S|S|^4+\lambda_{S\Phi}|S|^2|\Phi|^2+\mathsf{U}(1)_{\mathrm{FN}}$$
 breaking terms

→ VEV at
$$T = 0$$

 $S = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v_S + \sigma + i\rho)$

Field-dependent fermion masses

🖙 e.g. Froggatt-Nielsen mechanism

C Froggatt & Nielsen (1979); see lectures by Mu-Chun Chen

$$\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{FN}} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} y_{ij}^{u} \left(\frac{S}{\Lambda}\right)^{n_{ij}^{u}} \overline{Q}_{i} \, \widetilde{\Phi} \, u_{j} + \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} y_{ij}^{d} \left(\frac{S}{\Lambda}\right)^{n_{ij}^{d}} \overline{Q}_{i} \, \Phi \, d_{j} + \mathrm{h.c.}$$

potential

$$\mathscr{V}_S=-\mu_S^2|S|^2+\lambda_S|S|^4+\lambda_{S\Phi}|S|^2|\Phi|^2+\mathsf{U}(1)_{\mathrm{FN}}$$
 breaking terms

► VEV at
$$T = 0$$

 $S = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (v_S + \sigma + i\rho) \alpha = \gamma \frac{\partial T_Y}{\partial \varepsilon} \sim 10^{-2}$
seffective potential
 $\mathcal{V}_{\text{eff}}(\sigma, T) = \gamma T_Y T^4 + \alpha T^4 \frac{\sigma}{\Lambda} + \frac{m_\sigma^2(T)}{2} \sigma^2 + \frac{\kappa}{3!} \sigma^3 + \frac{\lambda_S}{4} \sigma^4 + \dots$

Ferugio (2019); see lectures by Mu-Chun Chen The more recent example: modular flavor flavor symmetries $m \propto Y(\tau)$ fermion mass matrix modular form

☑ Feruglio (2019); see lectures by Mu-Chun Chen

more recent example: modular flavor flavor symmetries

 $m\propto Y(\tau)$

some couplings vanish at symmmetry-enhanced points

🗹 Baur, Nilles, Trautner & Vaudrevange (2019);...; 🗹 Feruglio, Gherardi, Romanino & Titov (2021);...; 🗹 Feruglio (2023);...

☑ Feruglio (2019); see lectures by Mu–Chun Chen

more recent example: modular flavor flavor symmetries

 $m \propto Y(\tau)$

- some couplings vanish at symmetry–enhanced points
 Baur, Nilles, Trautner & Vaudrevange (2019);...; Peruglio, Gherardi, Romanino & Titov (2021);...; Peruglio (2023);...
- ${}^{\scriptstyle \hbox{\tiny IMS}}$ more generally, the size of the couplings depends on τ

☑ Feruglio (2019); see lectures by Mu-Chun Chen

more recent example: modular flavor flavor symmetries

 $m \propto Y(\tau)$

- some couplings vanish at symmetry–enhanced points
 Baur, Nilles, Trautner & Vaudrevange (2019);...; Peruglio, Gherardi, Romanino & Titov (2021);...; Peruglio (2023);...
- ${}^{\scriptstyle \hbox{\tiny IMS}}$ more generally, the size of the couplings depends on τ
- ${}^{\scriptstyle \hbox{\scriptsize lsm}}$ many couplings vanish for ${\rm Im}\,\tau\to\infty$

☑ Feruglio (2019); see lectures by Mu–Chun Chen

more recent example: modular flavor flavor symmetries

 $m\propto Y(\tau)$

- some couplings vanish at symmetry–enhanced points
 Baur, Nilles, Trautner & Vaudrevange (2019);...; Peruglio, Gherardi, Romanino & Titov (2021);...; Peruglio (2023);...
- $^{\mbox{\tiny IMS}}$ more generally, the size of the couplings depends on τ
- ${}^{\scriptstyle \scriptstyle \rm I\!S\! o}$ many couplings vanish for ${\rm Im}\,\tau\to\infty$
- we could take e.g.

$$S = \operatorname{Im} \frac{\tau - \omega}{\tau + \omega}$$
$$\omega = e^{2\pi i/3}$$

Flavon dynamics

🗹 Lillard, MR, Tait & Trojanowski (2018)

the flavon gets driven away from its T = 0 minimum until it gets stopped by the mass term or Hubble friction

$$\Delta \sigma \simeq -lpha \frac{T^4}{\Lambda m_{
m eff}^2}$$
 where $m_{
m eff}^2 = 6H^2 + m_\sigma^2$

Flavon dynamics

Lillard, MR, Tait & Trojanowski (2018)

the flavon gets driven away from its T = 0 minimum until it gets stopped by the mass term or Hubble friction

$$\Delta \sigma \simeq -\alpha \, \frac{T^4}{\Lambda \, m_{\rm eff}^2} \qquad {\rm where} \, \, m_{\rm eff}^2 = 6 H^2 + m_\sigma^2$$

 ${}^{\scriptstyle \rm I\!S\!S}$ as the temperature decreases, the flavon undergoes oscillations around the T=0 minimum, which behave like nonrelativistic matter

Constraints on flavons



Constraints on flavons



Constraints on flavons



Constraints on flavons



Constraints on flavons



Constraints on flavons



Constraints on flavons



Constraints on flavons



Constraints on flavons



Constraints on flavons



Constraints on flavons



Constraints on flavons



Constraints on flavons



Constraints on flavons



Constraints on flavons



Constraints on flavons



Constraints on flavons


Thermal Effects on Nonthermal Species

Constraints on flavons



Thermal Effects on Nonthermal Species

Constraints on flavons



Thermal Effects on Nonthermal Species

Constraints on flavons

































































Constraints on flavons

Flavon oscillations



Constraints on flavons

Flavon oscillations


Flavon oscillations



Constraints on flavons

Flavon oscillations



Constraints on flavons





Constraints on flavons





Constraints on flavons





Constraints on flavons





Constraints on flavons





BBN constraints

BBN is a highly predictive and constrained theory explaining the primordial abundance of light elements

- BBN is a highly predictive and constrained theory explaining the primordial abundance of light elements
- however, late-decaying particles screw up these abundances



- BBN is a highly predictive and constrained theory explaining the primordial abundance of light elements
- however, late-decaying particles screw up these abundances





- BBN is a highly predictive and constrained theory explaining the primordial abundance of light elements
- however, late-decaying particles screw up these abundances











Cheek, Osiński, Roszkowski & Trojanowski (2023)

flavons may decay into dark matter

Cheek, Osiński, Roszkowski & Trojanowski (2023)

- flavons may decay into dark matter
- if flavons dominantly decay into dark matter this may help with the BBN constraints

- flavons may decay into dark matter
- if flavons dominantly decay into dark matter this may help with the BBN constraints
- for large regions of the parameter space the production via thermal displacement is more important than the freeze-in production



Cheek, Osiński, Roszkowski & Trojanowski (2023)

- flavons may decay into dark matter
- if flavons dominantly decay into dark matter this may help with the BBN constraints
- for large regions of the parameter space the production via thermal displacement is more important than the freeze-in production



symmetry-enhanced points? shumetry-enhanced boints; ^{§‡} Moduli trapping Wognli trabbing

 ${\it \ensuremath{\mathbb{S}}}$ original belief: moduli deviate from the T=0 minimum of the potential in the early universe

Moduli trapping at symmetry-enhanced points?

- ${\it \ensuremath{\mathbb{S}}}$ original belief: moduli deviate from the T=0 minimum of the potential in the early universe
- it has been argued that moduli may get trapped at symmetry-enhanced points
 e.g. C Kofman, Linde, Liu, Maloney, McAllister & Silverstein (2004)

- ${\scriptstyle \blacksquare}$ original belief: moduli deviate from the T=0 minimum of the potential in the early universe
- it has been argued that moduli may get trapped at symmetry-enhanced points
 e.g. C Kofman, Linde, Liu, Maloney, McAllister & Silverstein (2004)
- this mechanism may conceivably prevent the moduli from deviating from their T=0 minimum during inflation

- ${\scriptstyle \blacksquare}$ original belief: moduli deviate from the T=0 minimum of the potential in the early universe
- it has been argued that moduli may get trapped at symmetry-enhanced points
 e.g. C Kofman, Linde, Liu, Maloney, McAllister & Silverstein (2004)
- this mechanism may conceivably prevent the moduli from deviating from their T=0 minimum during inflation
- ${}^{\scriptstyle \rm I\!S\!S}$ however, thermal effects will always drive the moduli that determine gauge and Yukawa couplings away from their T=0 minima at high T

- ${\scriptstyle \hbox{\scriptsize $\hbox{\scriptsize $\ext{\scriptsize $\ext{}}\ext{\scriptsize $\ext{\scriptsize $\ext{\scriptsize $\ext{\scriptsize $\ext{\ $\ext{\ $\ext{\scriptsize $\ext{\ }\ext{\ $\ext{\ }\ext{\ $\ext{\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$
- it has been argued that moduli may get trapped at symmetry-enhanced points
 e.g. C Kofman, Linde, Liu, Maloney, McAllister & Silverstein (2004)
- ${}^{\scriptstyle \rm I\!S\!S}$ this mechanism may conceivably prevent the moduli from deviating from their T=0 minimum during inflation
- ${}^{\scriptstyle \rm I\!S\!S}$ however, thermal effects will always drive the moduli that determine gauge and Yukawa couplings away from their T=0 minima at high T

bottom-line:

moduli problems more severe than generally appreciated

Summary Summary

potential of nonequilibrated species receives temperature-dependent corrections

 $\Delta \mathscr{V} = \mathcal{F} \big(g(S), y(S) \big)$

potential of nonequilibrated species receives temperature-dependent corrections

 $\Delta \mathscr{V} = \mathcal{F}\big(g(S), y(S)\big)$

 $^{\rm ISS}$ bound on reheating temperature in standard mechanisms of dilaton fixing: $T_R \lesssim \sqrt{m_S\,M_{\rm P}}$

potential of nonequilibrated species receives temperature-dependent corrections

 $\Delta \mathscr{V} = \mathcal{F}\bigl(g(S), y(S)\bigr)$

- $^{\rm ISS}$ bound on reheating temperature in standard mechanisms of dilaton fixing: $T_R \lesssim \sqrt{m_S\,M_{\rm P}}$
- cosmological constraints on models with "light" flavons

potential of nonequilibrated species receives temperature-dependent corrections

 $\Delta \mathscr{V} = \mathcal{F}\bigl(g(S), y(S)\bigr)$

- $^{\rm ISS}$ bound on reheating temperature in standard mechanisms of dilaton fixing: $T_R \lesssim \sqrt{m_S\,M_{\rm P}}$
- cosmological constraints on models with "light" flavons
- moduli problem more severe than generally appreciated

Summary

Summary





- there are many conceivable implications of the temperature-dependence of couplings:
 - affect relic abundance of DM and other particles



- there are many conceivable implications of the temperature-dependence of couplings:
 - affect relic abundance of DM and other particles
 - out-of-equilibrium condition for baryogenesis easier to satisfy



- there are many conceivable implications of the temperature-dependence of couplings:
 - affect relic abundance of DM and other particles
 - out-of-equilibrium condition for baryogenesis easier to satisfy
 - phase transitions change



- there are many conceivable implications of the temperature-dependence of couplings:
 - affect relic abundance of DM and other particles
 - out-of-equilibrium condition for baryogenesis easier to satisfy
 - phase transitions change
 - flatness of inflaton potential may be easier to accomplish if couplings switch off (interplay between moduli and inflaton)

Thanks a lot!
References I

Brian Batell & Akshay Ghalsasi. "Thermal misalignment of scalar dark matter." Phys. Rev. D, 107(9):page L091701 (2023). URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.107.L091701. 2109.04476.

Martin Bauer, Torben Schell & Tilman Plehn. "Hunting the Flavon." Phys. Rev., D94(5):page 056003 (2016). URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.94.056003. 1603.06950.

Alexander Baur, Hans Peter Nilles, Andreas Trautner & Patrick K. S. Vaudrevange. "A String Theory of Flavor and CP." Nucl. Phys. B, 947:page 114737 (2019). URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2019.114737. 1908.00805.

Wilfried Buchmüller, Koichi Hamaguchi, Oleg Lebedev & Michael Ratz.
"Dilaton destabilization at high temperature." Nucl. Phys., B699:pages 292 (2004). hep-th/0404168.

References

References II

Wilfried Buchmüller, Koichi Hamaguchi & Michael Ratz. "Gauge couplings at high temperature and the relic gravitino abundance." Phys. Lett., B574:pages 156 (2003). URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2003.09.017. hep-ph/0307181.

Andrew Cheek, Jacek K. Osiński, Leszek Roszkowski & Sebastian Trojanowski. "Dark matter production through a non-thermal flavon portal." JHEP, 03:page 149 (2023). URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/JHEP03(2023)149. 2211.02057.

Mu-Chun Chen & Volodymyr Takhistov. "Baryogenesis, Dark Matter, and Flavor Structure in Non-thermal Moduli Cosmology." JHEP, 05:page 101 (2019). URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/JHEP05(2019)101. 1812.09341.

Michele Cicoli, Joseph P. Conlon, Anshuman Maharana, Susha Parameswaran, Fernando Quevedo & Ivonne Zavala. "String Cosmology: from the Early Universe to Today." (2023). 2303.04819.

References

References III

- G. D. Coughlan, W. Fischler, Edward W. Kolb, S. Raby & Graham G. Ross. "Cosmological Problems for the Polonyi Potential." Phys. Lett., B131:page 59 (1983). URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(83)91091-2.
- B. de Carlos, J.A. Casas, F. Quevedo & E. Roulet. "Model independent properties and cosmological implications of the dilaton and moduli sectors of 4-d strings." Phys. Lett., B318:pages 447 (1993). URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(93)91538-X. hep-ph/9308325.
- L. Dolan & R. Jackiw. "Symmetry Behavior at Finite Temperature." Phys. Rev. D, 9:pages 3320 (1974). URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.9.3320.
- Rob Fardon, Ann E. Nelson & Neal Weiner. "Dark energy from mass varying neutrinos." JCAP, 10:page 005 (2004). URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2004/10/005. astro-ph/0309800.

References IV

Ferruccio Feruglio. "Are neutrino masses modular forms?" In Aharon Levy, Stefano Forte & Giovanni Ridolfi (Editors), "From My Vast Repertoire ...: Guido Altarelli's Legacy," pages 227–266 (2019). URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1142/9789813238053_0012. 1706.08749.

- Ferruccio Feruglio. "Universal Predictions of Modular Invariant Flavor Models near the Self-Dual Point." Phys. Rev. Lett., 130(10):page 101801 (2023). URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.130.101801. 2211.00659.
- Ferruccio Feruglio, Valerio Gherardi, Andrea Romanino & Arsenii Titov. "Modular invariant dynamics and fermion mass hierarchies around $\tau = i$." JHEP, 05:page 242 (2021). URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/JHEP05(2021)242. 2101.08718.
- C.D. Froggatt & Holger Bech Nielsen. "Hierarchy of Quark Masses, Cabibbo Angles and CP Violation." Nucl. Phys., B147:page 277 (1979). URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213(79)90316-X.

References

References V

Renata Kallosh & Andrei D. Linde. "Landscape, the scale of SUSY breaking, and inflation." JHEP, 0412:page 004 (2004). URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2004/12/004. hep-th/0411011.

Gordon Kane & Martin Wolfgang Winkler. "Deriving the Inflaton in Compactified M-theory with a De Sitter Vacuum." Phys. Rev., D100(6):page 066005 (2019). URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.100.066005. 1902.02365.

Gordon Kane & Martin Wolfgang Winkler. "Baryogenesis from a Modulus Dominated Universe." JCAP, 02:page 019 (2020). URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2020/02/019. 1909.04705.

Lev Kofman, Andrei D. Linde, Xiao Liu, Alexander Maloney, Liam McAllister & Eva Silverstein. "Beauty is attractive: Moduli trapping at enhanced symmetry points." JHEP, 05:page 030 (2004). URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2004/05/030. hep-th/0403001.

References VI

Benjamin Lillard, Michael Ratz, M. P. Tait, Tim & Sebastian Trojanowski. "The Flavor of Cosmology." JCAP, 1807(07):page 056 (2018). URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2018/07/056. 1804.03662.